

**To:** CN=Karen Jurist/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Gary Riley/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=HarryL Allen/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Tom Dunkelman/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Bret Moxley/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Debbie Schechter/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Jere Johnson/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA[]; N=Gary Riley/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=HarryL Allen/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Tom Dunkelman/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Bret Moxley/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Debbie Schechter/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Jere Johnson/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA[]; N=HarryL Allen/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Tom Dunkelman/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Bret Moxley/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Debbie Schechter/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Jere Johnson/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA[]; N=Tom Dunkelman/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Bret Moxley/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Debbie Schechter/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Jere Johnson/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA[]; N=Bret Moxley/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Debbie Schechter/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Jere Johnson/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA[]; N=Debbie Schechter/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Jere Johnson/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA[]; N=Jere Johnson/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA[]

**Cc:** CN=Erin Foresman/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA@EPA[]

**Bcc:** []

**From:** CN=Tim Vendlinski/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US

**Sent:** Thur 6/9/2011 6:09:39 PM

**Subject:** update: comments requested by Friday (6/24): Hg section of the Bay Delta Action Plan  
[KJ Comments on Action Plan.docx](#)  
[suisun marsh + delta talk Siegel UCD 5-23-11 workshop.pdf](#)  
<http://www.epa.gov/region9/water/watershed/sfbay-delta/index.html>  
<http://www.doi.gov/documents/CAWaterWorkPlan.pdf>

Hi All:

Gary is away until 6/20, and I don't expect to hear back from him before then.

Also, Tom D. called me today and graciously offered to confer with Drs. Alpers and Marvin-DiPasquale about our Cache Creek issue/opportunity when he meets with them next week in Nevada. As Tom suggested, I'll also follow-up with Jere Johnson to discuss her experience toward addressing mercury in a riverine system (she worked on the Carson River project -- Jere, I'll see you at Peet's!).

Gary and Tom, please touch base and discuss how to best incorporate your comments into the document sent to me by Karen J. (below).

Also, to give everyone a visual sense of what we're grappling with on the Delta, I'm attaching a presentation that includes a map of potential restoration areas that mostly lie within the uplands and the periphery of the Delta (page #19). The ~8 potential restoration sites in the NW Delta within and along the margin of the Yolo Bypass correspond geographically to the places where mercury is being deposited from the Cache Creek watershed.

That's all for now. Thanks, Tim

~~~~~  
Tim Vendlinski  
Senior Policy Advisor  
Office of the Director (WTR-1)  
EPA Pacific Southwest Region  
75 Hawthorne Street  
San Francisco, CA 94105-3901  
~~~~~

>vendlinski.tim@epa.gov<  
phone: 415.972.3469  
fax: 415.947.3537  
<http://www.epa.gov/region9/water/watershed/sfbay-delta/index.html>

From: Tim Vendlinski/R9/USEPA/US  
To: Karen Jurist/R9/USEPA/US@EPA@EPA, Gary Riley/R9/USEPA/US@EPA@EPA, HarryL Allen/R9/USEPA/US@EPA@EPA, Tom Dunkelman/R9/USEPA/US@EPA@EPA, Bret Moxley/R9/USEPA/US@EPA  
Cc: Karen Schwinn/R9/USEPA/US@EPA@EPA, Debbie Schechter/R9/USEPA/US@EPA@EPA  
Date: 06/08/2011 03:31 PM  
Subject: comments requested: Hg section of the Bay Delta Action Plan

Hi Everyone: In response to the message from Gary below, I'm sending out the comments submitted by Karen so Gary can make additions directly to this document (and thanks for sending comments, Karen).

To answer Karen's question: yes, this document will be reviewed by the Senior Management Team. A number of stakeholders will be interested in EPA's proposed actions, so the Action Plan have a relatively high-profile. Once we polish the draft Action Plan for Alexis' review, we'll work with her to circulate the document to the SMT. Our goal is to make that happen within the next 3-weeks, and ultimately, we'll release the final Action Plan by fall 2011.

Ideally, Superfund Division will send me a single, unified document that contains comments from all three of your sections. That means this is the best time for the Emergency Response Section to weigh-in. Once your Division sends me a document with consolidated comments, I'll take my turn at editing the piece, and I'll follow-up with individuals on a case-by-case basis if there are conflicting viewpoints or a greater need for clarification.

Karen might have spoken on your behalf when she asked me how R9 ever came to writing the Action Plan in the first place.

In response, I sent her the attached link to the interagency, Interim Federal Action Plan for the Bay Delta. At this link you can trace the origins of this effort.

Please note that the Interim Federal Action Plan is different from the R9 Action Plan (which means it's time for a change in title).

All the Best, Tim

----- Forwarded by Tim Vendlinski/R9/USEPA/US on 06/08/2011 03:20 PM -----

From: Gary Riley/R9/USEPA/US  
To: Tim Vendlinski/R9/USEPA/US@EPA  
Date: 06/08/2011 02:21 PM  
Subject: Re: Bay Delta Action Plan: DRAFT wetlands element (includes mercury issues on Cache Creek watershed)

Hi Tim,

I do want to add some details/clarification on Sulphur Bank Mine. I'm sorry it's taken awhile; I will try to get to it in the next couple of days.

Thanks for the opportunity to include this content!

Gary

--

Gary J. Riley, P.E.  
Environmental Engineer  
Superfund Project Manager/Superfund Reuse Coordinator  
U.S. EPA, Region 9  
415-972-3003 phone  
415-947-3528 fax

From: Karen Jurist/R9/USEPA/US  
To: Tim Vendlinski/R9/USEPA/US@EPA  
Date: 06/07/2011 05:50 PM  
Subject: Comments on Action Plan

Tim,

Discussed the Action Plan with Debbie again today and decided on this language:

Within the Cache Creek watershed, EPA will continue collaborating with interagency representatives in a joint effort to: (a) characterize the sources and releases of mercury within the system; (b) identify parties responsible for the abandoned/orphaned mines in the upper watershed; and (c) consider potential cleanup actions for abandoned mercury mines, for mercury hotspots within Cache Creek proper and at the eastern terminus at the creek (Cache Creek Settling Basin and the Yolo Bypass)

It should be clear that EPA is taking the lead in collaborating with other agencies, and that all the agencies will collectively characterize sources, ID PRPs, and consider cleanup action. As opposed to EPA committing to taking the lead on all of those actions. Does that make sense? Also, can you let me know if this is going to be reviewed by upper management and what is the timeline for that? Thanks!

Here it is in track changes:

Karen Jurist  
Site Assessment Manager  
U.S. EPA Region IX  
Superfund Division  
75 Hawthorne St, SFD 6-1  
San Francisco, CA 94105-3920  
(415) 972-3219

----- Forwarded by Tim Vendlinski/R9/USEPA/US on 06/08/2011 02:57 PM -----

From: Tim Vendlinski/R9/USEPA/US

To: Karen Jurist/R9/USEPA/US@EPA@EPA  
Date: 06/02/2011 06:25 PM  
Subject: Interim Federal Action Plan for the California Bay-Delta (2009)

Hi Karen:

Here's a link to the Interim Federal Action Plan for the California Bay-Delta(2009).

<http://www.doi.gov/documents/CAWaterWorkPlan.pdf>

EPA's commitment is made under the Water Quality section on page #14.

Thanks, Tim